

include the necessary spreadsheets. Accordingly, that production is a failed production because FOIA does not apply to documents going to the Congress of the United States, so you shouldn't have that redaction.

Also, I have repeatedly asked if Nicholas McQuaid is recused from the Hunter Biden criminal investigation, and that is an important thing because he seemed to work in the law firm that was representing Hunter Biden. And it ought to be a simple question to answer, but Attorney General Garland refuses to tell me whether McQuaid is recused from those cases.

At the Judiciary Committee's October 27, 2021, Justice Department oversight hearing, I said to Attorney General Garland:

When I placed holds on your nominees for the Department's failure to comply with Republican oversight requests, I said either you run the Department or the Department runs you. Right now, it looks like the Justice Department is running you.

That ends my quote of October 27 last year.

So that statement still holds true. Instead of protecting the American people, the Attorney General is sacrificing our Nation's top law enforcement agency to politics during a violent crime spike. Instead of being stewards of our Nation's laws, the Attorney General is leading the charge upending the rule of law. Instead of fighting for civil rights, he is chipping away at those civil rights.

Attorney General Garland, there is still time to change. You have 3 years left in this administration. I urge you to change course. I urge you to bring the Justice Department back to a place of leadership: leadership in reducing violent crime, leadership in maintaining the rule of law, and leadership in protecting our civil liberties.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

UKRAINE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the humanitarian crisis in Ukraine continues to escalate. Americans who walked by a newsstand on Monday were met with the wrenching picture of a Ukrainian family killed by Russian shelling, a mom and her two children struck down as they attempted to flee along a main evacuation route from Irpin to Kyiv, an evacuation route that Russia shelled.

Yesterday, the world saw pictures of the devastation after a maternity hospital in Mariupol, Ukraine—maternity hospital—fell victim to a Russian air strike.

President Zelenskyy reported that there were children buried under the rubble—children.

One newspaper reported:

The bombing took place during what was supposed to be a ceasefire in Mariupol so that civilians could evacuate. It marks the fourth time a so-called 'humanitarian cor-

ridor' out of the city has failed because Russian forces opened fire.

"[T]he fourth time a so-called 'humanitarian corridor' out of the city has failed because Russian forces opened fire."

"Opened fire" on civilians, on parents trying to save their children, this is what Russia is doing.

The scenes in Ukraine are unreal. They are scenes that we thought had finally been left behind in the dust of European history: devastated cities, apartment buildings with their sides sheared off, the smoking ruins of homes and businesses, a school reduced to rubble, mass graves.

In 2 short weeks, Vladimir Putin has wrought an unimaginable amount of devastation. The damage he has done will take years, if not decades, to rebuild. The scars may last much longer.

And for what, Mr. President? For what? For one man's vision of a Russian Empire. Vladimir Putin wants Ukraine, and he is apparently willing to destroy Ukraine to get it—destroy Ukraine and devastate his own nation, because Russia is suffering too because of Putin's war of aggression.

There are no smoking ruins of apartment buildings in Russia, but there is the senseless waste of so many young Russian lives, soldiers and conscripts sent to die in Ukraine for a war that is not their own. There is Putin's brutal crackdown on protesters and journalists, and there is the economic devastation his nation will suffer—is already suffering—as a result of sanctions and companies' decisions to pull out of Russia to protest its unprovoked attack on Ukraine. Vladimir Putin is laying waste to two countries.

These have been dark days for Ukraine, but the devastation in Ukraine has been met with determination. This is Ukrainians' fight, and they are not shrinking from it. The Washington Post recently reported that more than 66,000 Ukrainians who were outside the country have returned to answer President Zelenskyy's call to arms. That is 66,000 Ukrainians who could have sat in safety outside Ukraine who have returned to help defend their country.

Outnumbered as they are, the Ukrainian people are standing fast, and they are slowing down and in many places holding off the Russians. Soldiers and civilians alike have taken up arms to defend their nation, and it is clear that the spirit of Ukraine, now roused, will not be quenched.

No matter the resolve of the Ukrainian people, Ukraine cannot hold out alone. Without military, intelligence, and humanitarian support from other free nations, Ukraine may fall. We can't sit by and let that happen.

Congress is currently considering legislation to send additional military and humanitarian aid to Ukraine. I hope that we will be able to take a vote on this and very, very soon. As I have said before, the United States was too slow to send aid to Ukraine and sanction

Putin in the lead-up to Russia's attack. We can't afford to make the same mistake again.

I commend President Biden for doing the right thing this week and banning American imports of Russian energy. Every dollar we send to Russia to purchase energy is a dollar that Russia can use to prosecute its war in Ukraine.

Now, we need to focus on developing our energy resources here at home, all of them—all of them, conventional and alternative—to ensure that our Nation never again has to depend on countries like Russia for essential energy supplies. We should also take this oil ban a step further by enacting the bipartisan Crapo-Wyden bill to suspend permanent normal trade relations with Russia and Belarus.

The bill would also direct the U.S. Trade Representative to seek to suspend Russia from the World Trade Organization. A nation that flouts the rules and makes a mockery of diplomacy should not enjoy a seat at the table.

I heard directly from President Zelenskyy in a Zoom call Saturday, and he made a powerful appeal for help from the West. Among other things, President Zelenskyy requested that we help close the skies over Ukraine.

One solution that has been offered to help protect Ukrainian airspace is for Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovakia to provide their MiG-29 jets to Ukraine. We need to do everything that we can to help Ukraine in this fight, including helping to pave the way for Ukraine to get the air defense resources it needs.

Poland has stepped up and expressed a willingness to provide the MiGs, but we now find ourselves at a dead end as to how to facilitate the transfer to Ukraine. We need to find a solution, and I encourage the administration to find a way to safely navigate the logistics of such a transfer. After all that Ukraine has managed to do, it would be a tragedy to see the country lose its fight because the United States and other NATO countries could not agree on how to get the Ukrainians the resources they need.

While we should be cautious about what Putin may choose to do as his losses grow and his off-ramps dwindle, the United States and NATO cannot allow Moscow to dictate our actions. To do so would not only be to surrender Ukraine but to give a green light to despotic governments the world over, from China to Iran.

On Saturday, President Zelenskyy delivered an address to the Ukrainian people. "Free people of a free country," he began. "Free people of a free country." That is what Ukrainians are fighting for, to be a free people in a free country. And I think their fight is very close to the hearts of the American people, for after all, for what did our forefathers fight but to be a free people in a free land, to have the right to determine their own destiny and to live free of oppression?

"Free people of a free country." Long may the Ukrainians remain so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, let me thank Senator THUNE for his remarks.

I would simply add that I hope we can all keep in our hearts the prospect that the Ukrainians might actually win this thing, given the success they have already seen, as long as they get adequate support from us and the world community.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for a rather different reason. It is to call on this Chamber yet again to wake up to the urgent threat of climate change.

I wish I was done with these "Time to Wake Up" speeches. Frankly, I wish I had never had to deliver a single one.

I wish Congress had dealt with this threat—for instance, back when another Senator from Rhode Island, Republican John Chafee, held hearings on the looming challenge of carbon dioxide pollution.

I wish we had dealt with it when the House, under Speaker PELOSI, passed the Waxman-Markey climate change bill, only for Majority Leader Harry Reid and President Barack Obama to kill it in a Democratic Senate with a filibuster-proof majority.

I wish the Citizens United decision hadn't allowed the fossil fuel industry to capture the Republican Party and kill the bipartisanship on climate that existed before that decision in this Chamber.

In my church growing up, there was a prayer about things we have left undone that we ought to have done. In that spirit, here is a graphic on carbon emissions we prepared in conjunction with the Biden White House that charts out where we are on this problem.

Green, this line here, is carbon emissions business as usual if we keep kowtowing to the fossil fuel industry here and don't take serious climate action.

Orange, this line, with quite significant emissions savings, is the Finance Committee's climate tax package. That is the effect just of that climate tax package if it comes into law.

Down here is a clean electricity standard. If you could put into law a national U.S. clean electricity standard, you could reduce emissions to this gray line.

If you were to combine the two, if you were to combine the Finance Committee tax package and the clean electricity standard, you push emissions down to this yellow line.

Look at the blue line. This upper blue line is the carbon savings from a modest price on carbon, one that we have discussed and negotiated with the White House—\$15 per ton in 2023, rising to \$70 per ton in 2032. Look at how pow-

erful the emissions effect is of that single intervention.

Now, this lowest one that reduces emissions the most, this is the safety pathway. This dark blue emissions line is all of those policies together. That is what they add up to. That is what we could be doing. We could be creating a pathway to safety.

As these emissions results show, a carbon price is the key policy to hit the 50-percent emissions reduction target we have and to get on a pathway to safety. Well, that is not happening right now.

So, while fossil fuel-funded Republicans block legislative action on climate, what could be done through executive action? Regulation. It is not a substitute for ambitious legislation, but it can make a big difference.

The EPA has more or less restored Obama-era fuel economy and greenhouse gas emission standards for cars and light trucks. It has a proposal to regulate methane leakage from oil and gas facilities. It restored an Obama-era rule limiting mercury and other toxic air pollutants from coal-fired powerplants. That is all good, but it is a return to the pre-Trump polluter status quo, not progress—not new progress.

Here is what EPA could still do:

Start with regulations for big, easily identified sources of greenhouse gases, not just coal-fired powerplants but point sources, including in the industrial sector, which generates more than one-fifth of total greenhouse gas emissions. We need a multipronged regulatory approach targeting all major classes of point sources.

We need stronger rules for mercury, coal ash, soot, and other pollutants. Public health demands this, and it is even more urgent in light of climate change.

EPA can update the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and tighten National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

We need greenhouse gas emission standards for heavy-duty vehicles and for aviation. Focusing just on light-duty vehicles won't cut it.

Over at the Office of Management and Budget, they could finish an updated social cost of carbon and issue guidance requiring its use throughout—throughout—Agency decision-making. This is a big one. The social cost of carbon calculates the long-term damage from carbon pollution, and it should figure in permitting, leasing, grant-making, investments, international development assistance, trade agreements, and procurement.

A Trump judge—likely installed on the Federal Bench using fossil fuel dark money—just blocked the Obama-era social cost of carbon. While that is litigated, the administration is correctly pausing leases, permits, and other actions for greenhouse gas emitters.

At the Department of Interior, stop doling out leases to big polluters. The President promised to end new fossil fuel leases on public lands and waters,

so pause them while the social cost of carbon is litigated, and review them all to make sure that taxpayers are paid royalties that reflect the actual cost of fossil fuel production and combustion.

At the Department of Energy, update energy efficiency standards for light bulbs, washing machines, dryers, dishwashers, and all the electric appliances and products we use every day. There is low-hanging fruit there. I hear many of these rules are nearly ready but are held up in bureaucratic delay.

Get a move on.

The Department of Energy should also, along with the EPA and the Department of Agriculture, update the renewable fuel standards to ensure that renewable fuels actually generate considerable emissions reductions.

Here is another simple one: Federal procurement.

Update Federal acquisition regulations so Agencies price in the cost of emissions when they are buying products. Do that, and maybe we wouldn't wind up purchasing Postal Service delivery trucks with internal combustion engines no more efficient than their decades-old predecessors. Heck, we might even end up with clean, high-performing electric postal trucks. There is more to this regulatory list, but let me leave it there.

With legislation and regulation ought to come litigation. There are States, cities, counties across the country that have filed lawsuits against the fossil fuel industry based on local harm suffered as a result of climate change, and there is precedent for those at the Federal level.

In 1999, the Justice Department filed a civil lawsuit against Big Tobacco and its front groups, charging that they "engaged in and executed—and continue to engage in and execute—a massive 50-year scheme to defraud the public." That is the language in the Department of Justice's complaint.

Well, it went to trial, and a few years later, U.S. District Judge Gladys Kessler agreed. She found that the tobacco industry had "coordinated significant aspects of their public relations, scientific, legal, and marketing activity in furtherance of a shared objective—to . . . maximize industry profits by preserving and expanding the market for cigarettes through a scheme to deceive the public." That is the language in the decision, "a scheme to deceive."

So here is a useful exercise: Pop out the word "cigarettes" in that decision, and drop in "fossil fuel." Judge Kessler's finding in the tobacco case describes exactly what the fossil fuel industry has perpetrated: "coordinated significant aspects of their public relations, scientific, legal, and marketing activity in furtherance of a shared objective—to . . . maximize industry profits by preserving and expanding the market for fossil fuels through a scheme to deceive the public."

Nothing—nothing—prevents the Department of Justice from at least investigating whether to follow its own